

COMMON SENSE
IN SOME FREE
REMARKS
On the EFFICIENCY of the
MORAL CHANGE.

ADDRESSED TO THOSE
Who deny such EFFICIENCY to be MORAL.

By a BY-STANDER. *K*

I will not be negligent to put you always in Remembrance of these Things, though ye know them, and be established in the present Truth.

Apost. Pet. II. Epist. i. 12.

Bellarmino the Papist, saith of the Moral Change: Non cogendo, sed suadendo, & invitando, ita ut in Potestate Voluntatis relinquatur consentire Vocanti.

Lib. V. Cap. 29.

Augustine cont. Pelagianos, Lib. I. Cap. 18. saith, Laborant Homines invenire in Voluntate, quid boni sit nostrum, quod non sit ex Deo; quod quomodo inveniri possit ignero. And Art. III. cont. Pelag. he saith, Cum peccavit primus Homo, non in Parte aliqua, sed in tota qua conditus est Natura deliquit.

Vid. Willer's Synop. p. 923. 934.

NEW-YORK:

Printed by SAMUEL INSLEE and ANTHONY CAR. 1772.

BRITISH MUSEUM

1851

EXHIBITION OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM



BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE
BRITISH MUSEUM

COMMON SENSE,

In some free REMARKS on the EFFICIENCY

OF THE

MORAL CHANGE.



THE Debate of the Times, appears to centre in this Proposition. Scil. *Is human Nature totally disaffected to the divine Character?* Pro's and Con's have appeared through the Press. Both Sorts appear averse to deny, that human Nature is at present depraved; but the latter seem to affirm on the Point with Reserve.

'Tis plain, the Pieces on this Side, are in Pain, to keep a certain safe Medium, between denying Depravity, by which they would sustain a double Risque, viz. of Conscience and Credit; and affirming it *bona Fide*, and in full Terms; which would be giving up the Point.

One of the Pieces in this Class, speaks on this wise, viz. As the Depravity is allowed to be moral, and the Change in Regeneration is also moral, so this Change must be effected by a moral Influence. And then insists that the Change, and the Power

B

effecting

effecting it, must be both moral, or both physical. Whereas it is evident, *a moral Change*, can be effected by no Operation but a physical one.

The Point is of Importance enough to induce every Man to take a Side; and to engage every Hand, not excepting the weak or the withered, to be extended in Suffrage.

To throw a little Light therefore, on this Affair, let us first settle our Views of the Expressions used in it: and then adjust our Notions of moral Depravity: and so we shall see how human Nature is affected to the Deity; and whether the above Position, viz. that *a moral Change can be wrought by no Operation but that which is physical*, will obtrude itself on us or not. Now whoever is attentive, as a Philosopher, in this Pursuit, will certainly receive Light, if he finds it.

We are first called to seek clear and uniform Ideas, of the Words and Expressions used in this Disquisition.

1. The Word *Character*, is Greek, and is derived from *charásco*, and 'tis rendered by *Sculpo*, *imprimo*, &c. to *carve*, *engrave*, *impress*, *print*, &c. Of Course, *Character* itself, is that visible or sensible Form, which such Sculpture or Impression makes. And so it appears, that there is no such Thing in Propriety of Speech, as an *unknown*, *invisible*, or *secret Character*. But *Character*, is that *visible*, *known*, *manifest Form*, or *Appearance*, in and by which the Subject of the Character is seen, known, and characterized.

2. Of Course, the *divine Character* is not any Thing merely supposed, or imagined about the Deity; but it is that by which He is evidently represented, shewed and made known, to every intelligent Creature. If every moral Creature is a Subject of moral Obligations, he is a Subject of the Knowledge of the divine Character; for they all derive from it, and depend upon it. A moral Creature, who has not the Knowledge of the divine Character, is naturally, and therefore necessarily, not unable only, but incapable to obey God; and so is not guilty if he don't. 'Tis not possible to obey Government, of which we have no Knowledge; or to be accountable to it at all. And if the Want of any one divine Attribute would vacate all divine Government,

and

and all moral Bonds, then the Knowledge of every divine Attribute, must be in every Subject of that Government; and for that Reason, must necessarily be contained in that divine Character, of which every moral Creature, as such, must be conscious. Just so the Apostle reasons, Rom i. 19, &c. shewing why Wrath is revealed against even the Heathen, "because that which may be known of God, is manifest in them, even his eternal Power and God-head." Yet "when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, &c."

Now if a conscious Creature, can be in a State of Indifference to this known Character of God, so as neither to love nor hate it, then there is a Medium in Morality, between Love and Hatred, Virtue and Vice, moral Good and moral Evil. And then a Train of Consequences must be drawn, against the well-known Character of God; one of whose Motto's is, "He who is not for me, is against me"; admitting no Medium. Then also, perhaps all Men are not contained in the Characters of righteous and wicked; and so can't be Subjects of revealed Rewards or Punishments. And so a fair Road lies to the *Limbus Patrum*.

But if no such State of Indifference can be, then every Man, with every Action, Word and Thought, must take Rank, in either Love or Hatred to the divine Character. For it must be allowed to be already settled by good Authority, that "no Man can serve two Masters." So then what is not loved in a moral Sense, is hated by the same Test.

Well then, if Love, which is always the Reason of Choice, and so is the Spring of Action, always refuseth, what it does not chuse; and such refusing, is just as much an Expression of Hatred in that Case, as chusing is an Expression of Love; then 'tis evident, that either the Wickedness, which all Mankind do chuse naturally, is the Evidence of Love, and cordial Conformity to the divine Character which they know; and Holiness, which they at the same Time refuse, would be Proof of Hatred to divine Objects; or else the Wickedness which they chuse, and thereby express their Love, is the Reverse of such Conformity, and so an evident Demonstration, in constant Facts, that the divine Character

effecting it, must be both moral, or both physical. Whereas it is evident, *a moral Change*, can be effected by no Operation but a physical one.

The Point is of Importance enough to induce every Man to take a Side; and to engage every Hand, not excepting the weak or the withered, to be extended in Suffrage.

To throw a little Light therefore, on this Affair, let us first settle our Views of the Expressions used in it: and then adjust our Notions of moral Depravity: and so we shall see how human Nature is affected to the Deity; and whether the above Position, viz. that *a moral Change can be wrought by no Operation but that which is physical*, will obtrude itself on us or not. Now whoever is attentive, as a Philosopher, in this Pursuit, will certainly receive Light, if he finds it.

We are first called to seek clear and uniform Ideas, of the Words and Expressions used in this Disquisition.

1. The Word *Character*, is Greek, and is derived from *charásco*, and 'tis rendered by *Sculpo*, *imprimo*, &c. to *carve*, *engrave*, *impress*, *print*, &c. Of Course, *Character* itself, is that visible or sensible Form, which such Sculpture or Impression makes. And so it appears, that there is no such Thing in Propriety of Speech, as an *unknown*, *invisible*, or *secret Character*. But *Character*, is that *visible*, *known*, *manifest Form*, or *Appearance*, in and by which the Subject of the Character is seen, known, and characterized.

2. Of Course, the *divine Character* is not any Thing merely supposed, or imagined about the Deity; but it is that by which He is evidently represented, shewed and made known, to every intelligent Creature. If every moral Creature is a Subject of moral Obligations, he is a Subject of the Knowledge of the divine Character; for they all derive from it, and depend upon it. A moral Creature, who has not the Knowledge of the divine Character, is naturally, and therefore necessarily, not unable only, but incapable to obey God; and so is not guilty if he don't. 'Tis not possible to obey Government, of which we have no Knowledge; or to be accountable to it at all. And if the Want of any one divine Attribute would vacate all divine Government,
and

and all moral Bonds, then the Knowledge of every divine Attribute, must be in every Subject of that Government; and for that Reason, must necessarily be contained in that divine Character, of which every moral Creature, as such, must be conscious. Just so the Apostle reasons, Rom ii 19, &c. shewing why Wrath is revealed against even the Heathen, "because that which may be known of God, is manifest in them, even his eternal Power and God-head." Yet "when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, &c."

Now if a conscious Creature, can be in a State of Indifference to this known Character of God, so as neither to love nor hate it, then there is a Medium in Morality, between Love and Hatred, Virtue and Vice, moral Good and moral Evil. And then a Train of Consequences must be drawn, against the well-known Character of God; one of whose Motto's is, "He who is not for me, is against me"; admitting no Medium. Then also, perhaps all Men are not contained in the Characters of righteous and wicked; and so can't be Subjects of revealed Rewards or Punishments. And so a fair Road lies to the *Limbus Patrum*.

But if no such State of Indifference can be, then every Man, with every Action, Word and Thought, must take Rank, in either Love or Hatred to the divine Character. For it must be allowed to be already settled by good Authority, that "no Man can serve two Masters." So then what is not loved in a moral Sense, is hated by the same Test.

Well then, if Love, which is always the Reason of Choice, and so is the Spring of Action, always refuseth, what it does not chuse; and such refusing, is just as much an Expression of Hatred in that Case, as chusing is an Expression of Love; then 'tis evident, that either the Wickedness, which all Mankind do chuse naturally, is the Evidence of Love, and cordial Conformity to the divine Character which they know; and Holiness, which they at the same Time refuse, would be Proof of Hatred to divine Objects; or else the Wickedness which they chuse, and thereby express their Love, is the Reverse of such Conformity; and so an evident Demonstration, in constant Facts, that the divine Character

rafter which they know, and yet refuse and disobey, is the Object and Centre of their Hatred and Aversion.

3. To *deprave*, according to Mr. Bailey, an allowed Judge of the Sense of Words, signifieth, *to corrupt, to marr, to spoil*. And so a moral Being depraved, is a moral Being *corrupted, marred, spoiled*. Now as human Affections are allowed to be depraved, they must be allowed to be *corrupted, marred, spoiled*. But to what Purpose are they so? Why, to all the Purposes of right Exercise to the first Object of them; which is the divine Nature, as exhibited to them in his *known Character*. But is there any Medium between Affections *corrupted* and *spoiled*, touching the divine Character, as their object, and a State of Disaffection to that Object? If not, then either Mr. Bailey must be corrected in his Definition of Depravedness, or else the human Affections must be allowed to be in a State of Disaffection to the divine Nature and Character.

We shall find the same Conclusion, if we examine the other Formations of the Word in English; and those of the same Signification in Latin and Greek. *Depravedness*, for Instance, is a *rooted Habit of Naughtiness*. And when this is charged on the human Affections, does it make them look somewhat like the divine Nature, *Nam similes tantum se mutuum afficiunt*? If not, but our Minds are struck, with the Idea of Contrariety; then we must say, either that this Definition is bad also, or else that such rootedly naughty Affections must be totally opposite, disaffected, and averse to every View of the Nature and Character of God.

Also the Greek Word which signifieth *to deprave*, is *diaphtheiroo*, *to corrupt thoroughly*; and is used, Luke xii. 33, to describe a Thing spoiled by being Moth-eaten. And, 1 Tim. vi. 5, it is used to describe the Corruption of Minds, which are *destitute of the Truth*. In Rev. viii. 9, it is rendered *destroyed*. It is twice used to the same Purpose, in Rev. xi. 18. And doubtless, whoever shall still insist, that there is Likeness enough to the divine Nature, in such a corrupt Mind, to furnish a Measure of Love, is himself an Example and Proof of the Contrary. For as there are no Contrarieties greater than those of the moral Kind; and none of these

these, greater than Depravity and Rectitude; Enmity and Love; the former of which can be proved to be in all Men, as fallen Beings; and the latter are allowed to be in the divine Nature. So either the proper Sense of *Depravity* and *Enmity*, must be denied, and the natural Notion of *Rectitude* and *Love*, in their first Subject infinitely debased and vilified, in order to make out something short of a total Contrariety between the two Sorts of moral Qualities; or else their proper Import must be allowed, and then the total Contrariety, and consequent Disaffection, will stand confessed.

4. The Word *Change*, is often used ambiguously; but when its precise Sense is of Importance, its proper Import should be distinguished. Now such is the present Case: for they who deny the total Disaffection, and of Course the physical Efficiency in Regeneration, use the Word *Change*, in a Sense quite different from those who maintain the affirmative Side, on those Points. They both call Regeneration a *Change*; but 'tis evident, the former mean *only Alteration*; whereas the latter hold Regeneration to be a *Change*, in its proper Sense. Now if the Words *Change* and *Alteration*, are well considered, it will appear, that those who mean to support the negative Side of the Question, have no Right to the Word *Change*, as proper Style for their Notion of Regeneration. For *Change*, strictly speaking, always takes Place *in the Nature* of it's Subject, and not in it's Circumstances, as such. Whereas *Alteration*, only implies some Variation of modal Circumstances. The Notion of *Alteration*, is relative, always referring, to that which, or to that from which the Alteration is made. But the proper Notion of *Change*, is absolute. *Change* implies, that it's Subject is not the same *in it's Nature*, that it was before; but is *in itself* another, than what it was before. Whereas *Alteration* imports it's Subject to be different, *only in certain Circumstances*, but not in it's *very Nature*, from what it was before. So a Thing *only altered*, remains the same *in itself*, but under some differing Circumstances; whereas a Thing *changed*, is not the same that it was, but is another Thing *in it's Nature*.

If it should be said, a Thing must be said to be *altered*, when 'tis *changed*; it may in Answer be asked, what it is altered from? It will be said, from what it was before; but this is viewing the Thing *relatively*; and *Alteration*, is allowed to imply a relative Difference of any Subject, from what it was before. So every Change, may in a relative Sense be called an *Alteration*: but no *Alteration*, as such, can strictly be called a *Change*; because after shifting all relative Circumstances, the *Nature* of the Subject still remains the same.

The Word frequently used in the New Testament, which signifieth to change, is *allatto*, from *allos*, to be another. And *Allattomai*, to be made another. The Use of it may be seen, 1 Cor. xv. 51, 56, Rom. i. 23, 25, Heb. i. 12, and many other Places. In which the above Notion of *Change*, in Distinction from *Alteration*, is supported.

Beside, the Scripture useth the Word *Change* often, where *Alteration*, in the above Sense, is evidently excluded; as in the Case of the Mosaic Priesthood and Law. The Scripture nowhere saith, they were *altered*, to make out the Gospel System; and the Reason is plain, because the Whole of them, as to their public Form, was to be abolished; but the Apostle saith they were both *changed* Heb. vii. 12. So the old Dispensation was not to remain, with some *Alterations* on it; but the *very Nature* of it, as a publick Dispensation, was to be wholly taken away, and another take Place in it's Stead. And this the Apostle calls *Change*.

Again, the Prophet, Jer. xiii. 23, pointing to the deep rooted wicked Habits of Mankind, saith "Can the Ethiopian change his Skin?"—&c. If he could *alter* it ever so much, it will not answer, because still it remains, in itself, the very same at Bottom; whereas the *very Nature* of the Ethiopian's Skin, in the View of this typical Reference, must be *changed*, if we admit the Reason and Sense of the Passage.

So also the marginal Reading of Heb. xii. 17, saith "Esau was rejected, because he found no Way to *change* his Mind." *Altered*, we know it was; and 'tis as evident it was not *changed*.

Lastly.

Lastly. Let Flesh and Blood be *altered* ever so much, they are still Flesh and Blood, and so cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, as the Apostle affirms, 1 Cor. xv. 50. Therefore in the next Verse, he saith, "We shall all be changed."

So it appears, that when we speak of the *moral Change*, we must be understood to mean a Change in the *Nature* of a Person's moral State; and not in any of the appending Circumstances only, of such moral States.

A Foreigner may live in great Subjection and Conformity to the British Laws and Customs; but his *civil State* still is that of alien, till he is naturalized by Act of Parliament. No Alteration of the Circumstances, as such, of his civil State, can be, or imply a Change, of his civil State. The Act of the civil State alone, gives being to Naturalization.

A Man may be altered vastly, without passing the moral Change; i. e. without being a Subject of true Morality. But when his *moral State* is *changed*, and the Principles of true Morality are begotten in him, there is something new takes Place, in the *very Nature* of his Moral State; so that it is not the same *in itself*, as it was before; which can't be said, when only a circumstantial Alteration takes Place respecting any Person's moral State.

If it should be said, this Argument will prove too much, because it seems to mean that the Faculties of the Soul must be changed; which would make Regeneration to be a physical, and not a moral Change. It may be answered by saying, that great Judges both of Words and Things, have stiled Regeneration a *physical Change*, not because any Faculty of the Soul, as such, is changed therein; for that never can be, on the Plan of the Bible. But because the Change takes Place in the *very Nature*, of that which is changed, viz. the moral State of those Faculties, and not in any Appendages of it only.

Obj. But the *moral State* of these Faculties, is an Appendage, a proper modal Circumstance of them; and therefore by this Argument, either such *moral State*, is not the Subject of the Change;

Change; directly contrary to what the Argument appears to design: or else, to suppose such circumstantial Appendage, to be the Subject of what is called the moral Change, is implicitly to deny the true Notion of a *moral Change*; and to make it to consist *only in a relative Alteration*. Which appears, as inconsistent with the Design of the Argument, as the other.

Ans. The moral State of the Faculties of the Soul, is so closely connected with their Being, that it is impossible to conceive them to exist out of moral State. 'Tis just the same as to conceive of an Understanding, which understands nothing; which is the same as no Understanding. Or of a Will, that wills not; which is the same as no Will at all. Or of Affections, which neither love nor hate; which is exactly the same as no Affections. For to understand, to will, and to affect, are evidently essential to any moral State. Yet the moral State of these Faculties, in a particular Person, may cease to be as it was; and may become what it was not before. And to deny this must imply, either a Denial of the fallen State of Mankind: or at least, a Denial that such Fall affected the *very Nature* of the moral State of Mankind. And if it did not make, or occasion, their moral State to be quite another in it's Nature than what it was before, then Mankind have some Ability naturally, to receive and distinguish the Things of the Spirit of God; may be able of themselves, to will and to do, of God's good Pleasure; their Affections are not totally alienated from the Life of God: nor are they in an abstract Sense "dead in Trespasses and Sins," as the God of Truth has said. And then, to be sure, the most that can be needful in the Case, is some Alteration, and Amendment of Deficiencies. And so there is no need of a moral Change. But if we must hold God to be true in his Account of these Matters, at the Expence of all these proud Notions of Men, then we must say, that the moral State of Mankind was totally changed by the Fall; and must be totally changed again, or the penal Consequence of Sin, Rebellion, and High Treason against God, must be sustained for ever.

Now,

Now, though moral Faculties can't be supposed to exist, out of moral State; yet since 'tis as evident, that there are different Kinds of moral State, as that Christ and Belial differ, in Respect to *their* moral State; so the simple Notion of moral State *itself*, is the *sole Object of Attention*, when we speak of the immediate Subject of the moral Change. 'Tis the moral State *itself*, that this Argument supposeth to be changed in Regeneration. The Objection supposeth the Soul, as a Soul; or the Faculties of it, as such, to be the immediate Object of Attention, when we are speaking of the Subject of the moral Change; and so imagineth, that if the moral State of it only is changed, then there is in this Change, only a modal Alteration of the Subject of Change. But 'tis not so. The moral State, the Kind of Connection with God, and his Kingdom, that takes Place there, is the whole and sole Object of View in this Affair. So the Argument designs, that the moral Change does not take Place, only in some circumstantial Respects of the moral State; *but in the very Nature of it*. And that such as suppose the former to be true, do implicitly deny the true Doctrine of the moral Change; and indeed render it quite needless, by maintaining in it's Place, what only amounts to an Alteration of some relative Circumstances of the moral State, to be necessary in Regeneration.

We come next to adjust our Notions of moral Depravity itself. Now moral Depravity must be either the direct Reverse of moral Rectitude; or a Medium, between moral Rectitude, and that which is directly the Reverse of it; or else it is moral Rectitude itself impaired, and out of Order.

If Depravity is only Rectitude impaired; *i. e.* Rectitude is still at the Bottom of all our Hearts, but the Superstructure is sadly broken and demolished: Like an old Castle, famous in it's Day, and whose foundations are still the same; but the building is decayed, and the Heap is encumbered with Rubbish, and infested with Vermin. Then it follows;

1. That either this Depravity does not imply equal Wickedness, and so is not, at least, not all of it, punishable by the Di-

vine Law; for nothing can be so, but Wickedness. Or else, if there is as much Wickedness, as there is Depravity; yet it can't avail to give Character to the Soul, and determine its moral State, to be a *State of Sin and Death*; because it's bottom Principles are still good; and it is only seduced from Time to Time, by flattering and delusive Charms; through meer Weakness; contrary to the sensible Nature, and feeble Stimulations of old divine Principles underneath. And so there is a reasonable Ground of Hope, *in the Nature of the Case*, for the Salvation of all, who have not with an high Hand, oppugned and set at naught, these good old Stimulations from beneath. Slender Ground also to conclude the Damnation of any, except the most audacious. And a credible Reason, (though not to be spoke out), for thinking hard of the one Supreme; because he shews no more Regard in his Conduct, to many who laboriously attend to the good Principles at Bottom. Though they with equal Constancy, and hearty Sincerity, are inattentive to, and always contemptive of, the Name and Blood, and Spirit and Word, of the Son of God. Good Ground, there is also in this Notion, to deny the total Disaffection to the divine Character; and the Need of a *Change of State*, properly so called. And to maintain the Necessity of *only a circumstantial Alteration*, respecting the moral State, in Order to Salvation.

But if neither of these will be admitted, and yet Depravity must be held to be *Reſtitution impaired*; we must say that moral Depravity does always imply equal Wickedness; and that a *depraved State*, is a *State of Sin and Death*; and since bottom Principles do always determine the State of the Soul; and these, in this Case, are said to be it's *Reſtitution*; so every Subject of moral Depravity, is in a *State of Sin and Death*; and at the same Time, in a *State of Righteousness and Life*. And if this Death and this Life, are in their respective Cases, each eternal; then to be morally depraved, determines a Person to be a Subject of eternal Death, and eternal Life at the same Time. And if these are the proper

proper Notions of Heaven and Hell, then a depraved Soul is enticed to both, as long as he remains depraved.

2. It follows, that if moral Rectitude is moral Goodness, then a depraved Soul is not destitute of moral Goodness. And so the Character of Man, since the Fall, quite through the Bible is denied with Boldness. And if the Design of Christ's coming, and shedding his Blood, was to open the Way to all Goodness, Righteousness and Life; then he came to do, what was in a Measure, quite needless. And so that most eminent Wisdom of God, is grossly impeached. And the highest Mercy, and the deepest Misery, which furnish the grand Materials of the Bible, are turned to Foolishness.

But if it should be said, that the Depravity of Mankind is such as implies, that they are not in a State of Rectitude *properly*, and we know as long as they are in this Life, they are not *properly* in the State of the Damned; so that it must be concluded, that the depraved State of Men in this Life, simply as a moral State, is a middle State between Rectitude and total Ruin.

It may be asked, in answer, What is the Difference between *condemned*, and *damned*? For it must be allowed, that all who are not Believers in Christ, are "condemned already." *John. iii.*

18. Why, it will be said, Damnation is the *Execution* of the Sentence of Condemnation, which lies already. And does the Execution of a just Sentence do any Hurt? Does it encrease the Sin and Guilt of the Criminal? Is he more wicked, merely by the Execution of the Sentence? Would not the Supposition of it, necessarily charge this Increase of Sin, on the Executor? But if the above Interrogatories, must be answered in the Negative; then it must be said, that Condemnation, as it now lies, supposeth as much moral Depravity, as Damnation itself does. And so it follows, as Damnation makes no Depravity, that there is *exactly no Difference*, in Respect to *the Nature* of a depraved State, between the Unregenerate, in this Life, (who are all Unbelievers) and the Damned. And so it appears, that the *Nature* of a depraved State, is the same in Condemnation now, as in Damnation

Damnation hereafter. One Circumstance differs them, *viz.* The Execution of Sentence in the latter. But as that cannot affect *the Nature of the State*; so Depravedness can be no Medium between Rectitude and Damnation.

Beside, are not Devils, and damned Men, all depraved Creatures? And have they any thing more, or worse, in their moral State, than moral Depravity? Their sealed Damnation, in itself, has added nothing to their Sinfulness; so they cannot be more depraved, simply by being damned. Then there can be no middle moral State of Men, between Rectitude and Damnation, which is *in it's Nature* different from the latter.

Yet a depraved State is certainly different from a State of Rectitude; and 'tis not yet, in Circumstances, the same with Damnation. Nor is it worse than a State of Sin; or better than a State of Rectitude.

Doubtless therefore we must conclude, that the moral Depravity of Men, in this Life, is in itself, and as constituting their moral State, as directly, and totally the Reverse of moral Rectitude, as that of the damned is.

Depravity is the Root or Habit, from which all actual Sin derives, or it is not; if the latter is supposed, then it follows; either that it is not wicked to be morally depraved, contrary to common Sense, and to what has been proved; or that there are two Sorts of Wickedness, distinct in their Natures, which is an Absurdity. Therefore this Depravity is, *itself*, the Habit of all Iniquity. And if it is obvious, that moral Rectitude is alike the Root, or Habit of moral Goodness; then 'tis as evident, that such depraved Habit, and the Habit of Rectitude, are direct Opposites, as that Wickedness and Goodness are Opposites.

Now Contraries illustrate one another. If then we can be clear in our Notions of moral Rectitude, we may be as clear in those of it's Opposite, *viz.* moral Depravity. But common Sense determines the former *to be Righteousness*; and also that Righteousness, is neither more, nor less, than *to be right*. But if moral Rectitude is *to be exactly right*; then moral Depravity is *to be exactly*

exactly wrong. If the former is to be *all right*; then the latter is to be *all wrong*. If Rectitude itself, or being right, imports the Subject to have *no Sin*; then Depravity itself, or being wrong, imports the Subject to have nothing but Sin. And this evidently forms the Character of depraved Mankind.

If to be in a State of Rectitude, is to be in a State which is quite right, and to be in a State of Depravity, is to be in a State which is quite wrong; both which have been proved, and are evident to common Sense; then this Rectitude, and this Depravity, are as evidently Opposites, as Right and Wrong.

Yet it may be of Use to this Demonstration, to view these opposite Qualities, or Characteristicks, in their first Subjects, respectively. Moral Rectitude will be allowed to have its Centre and Source, in the divine Nature. Satan also will be allowed to be the first Subject of moral Depravity. It must also be allowed, that in the divine Nature, is nothing but Rectitude; *i. e.* no Depravity at all. And doubtless it will be granted, that Satan has nothing but Depravity in the Nature of his moral State; that he has no Degree of moral Rectitude at all. Now don't the moral State of these two Objects of our Attention, form the highest Contrast of the Kind, that ever was in our Conception? Or that 'tis in the Power of Language to describe? And what constitutes the Contrast? Why, nothing but the bare Import of the Words *Rectitude* and *Depravity*, in the moral Sense. But is it not evident then, that moral Depravity is the direct Reverse of moral Rectitude? We see then what this Depravity is.

Man was said to be created in the Image of God; and we know also that the Image of God was Righteousness; or being right. And that, as in God is no Unrighteousness, so while human Rectitude continued, there was none in Man. If he had had Unrighteousness, any Wickedness, or Depravity at all; he could not have been a Subject of the Image of God. For Image implies *Likeness*, and there can be *no Likeness at all*, between wrong, though in the lowest Degree, and being right in the highest Degree, as God always is.

E

Now,

Now just as evident as this is, so evident it is, that the lowest Degree of being wrong, *totally* divests the Subject of the Image of God; for there is *no Degree* of Likeness between the lowest Degree of *wrong*, in a moral Sense, and the highest Degree of right in the same Sense. And if Likeness in this Case, must consist in Rectitude; for what can make Likeness in Man, to God who is all Rectitude, but Rectitude? And if this Rectitude consists in being all right, then as soon as Man ceased to be *all right*, he ceased to be a Subject of Rectitude; ceased also, at the same Time, and for the same Reason, to have the Image of God; because the Image of God consists in Rectitude.

The Moment therefore of Sin's Entrance to the human Nature, it was *totally destitute* of the Image of God. And this is as evident, as that there is no Sin in the divine Nature. It became the same Moment, *totally destitute* of Rectitude; and this is as evident, as that to be wrong, is not to be right; but directly the Reverse.

Obj. It will still be said, there is certainly Defect in this Argument; for the Conclusion is vastly too large for the Premises. It only supposeth a little Wickedness, nay *the lowest Degree of Sin*, to take Place in Man, and then concludes that the Whole of the glorious Image of his Creator, is *totally gone*; and the Whole of his perfect State of moral Rectitude, is also *totally gone*. 'Tis surely unreasonable to suppose so small and slender Cause, should produce so vast an Effect.

Beside, suppose Sin to enter *a little Way* into the human Heart, are there not large and noble Territories left, for the Inhabitation and Residence of moral Rectitude? Like a noble Palace, where, if a thievish Tyrant enters at a back Door, and possesseth himself of a dark and dirty Kitchen; are not the noblest Apartments still left for the Accommodation of their native Lord?

Ans. If the Objector had received a little Light, about the divine Nature; about the Nature of the human Soul; and about

about the Nature of Sin; it would have prevented this very absurd Objection.

1. It has been observed, that the very Notion of *Image*, is Likeness. To have the Image of God then, is to have Likeness to God. Now, either this *Likeness* consisted in Man's having Rectitude equally extensive as his Nature; so that every Degree of his Capacity was fully possessed of it, and so he was *all right*; and that this determined his being in the Image of God; and if so, 'tis evident, that the Essence of this Image, or Likeness, lies in his being *all right*; so that when he ceased to be *all right*, the whole of the Image of God was gone.

Or else, this Likeness consisted in his having some Wickedness. The Likeness of God he had, and it did consist in something. If it did not consist in the *Perfection* of his Rightness, it must consist in the *Imperfection* of it; or else, in the total Want of it, which nobody can believe. And that it should consist in *Rightness imperfect*, necessarily supposeth the Divine Nature imperfect in the same Sense. Otherwise, how could Imperfection be the perfect Image, or the true and proper Likeness of it? But this also is absolutely incredible. Then let us rest in the evident Truth of our first Conclusion; *viz.* That the Image of God on human Nature consisted, in that *Perfection of moral Rectitude*, which the human Nature had. So that if only *this Perfection* is gone, the whole of Likeness is gone. So if the Rectitude, or Rightness, of the human Nature consisted in it's being right, then as soon as it is wrong, there is no Rectitude in it; because *it is not right*.

The peculiar Excellencies of the divine Nature, do all consist in their *Perfection*. And to suppose any thing can be just like *perfect Rightness*, which is itself *not perfectly right*; which, in moral Cases always implies some Wickedness, is at once to destroy the Nature and Difference of Right and Wrong. If moral Imperfection, which is Wickedness, is just like divine Perfection; it must be because there is no Difference between them. Now this highest

highest of all Absurdities and Falshoods, must be admitted; or else it must be granted, that the Image of God on the human Nature at first, consisted in that human Nature's *Rectitude*, or being *all right*. And consequently; that in the very Instant, in which it ceased to be so, it was *totally void* of the Image of God, because it was totally void of Rectitude, or of being *all right*; which only can constitute Likeness to God. And if there can be no Medium between right and wrong, then to be void of Rectitude, is to be full of Wickedness. And to be wholly excluded from the Character of being all right, is to be wholly included in the Character of being all wrong. And to be out of a State of Rectitude, is to be in a State of Sin; and so to be under all it's Consequences, both of Nature and Law.

2. The supposed Objector, is perplexed for Want of a consistent View of the human Soul. Now, whether we call the Soul, *a thinking Substance*; or *a Power of thinking*; or *a thinking Power*; it will still be evident, that the whole of it, is some how employed in every rational Action; that there is no Faculty in it useless in any proper Action of it. If there is any Faculty of the Soul, wholly useless, unemployed, and unconcerned, in any rational Action, it is in that Case, wholly unaccountable and unrewardable. The Soul cannot be called to an Account, for the Improvement of all it's Powers, in such Cases. Or be rewarded, or punished, for the Use or Abuse of all it's Abilities, in such Cases. Nor does either Honour or Dishonour redound to God in such Cases. As far forth, as any Faculty of the Soul, is wholly useless, and unconnected with the other Faculties, in any proper Action of the Soul, just so far the Soul is in that Case, neither chargeable with Sin or Holiness. Just so far it has no Connection at all with, or Relation to, the Will of God, his holy Law, or universal Dominion; *i. e.* just so far the Soul is not a moral Being. And if all this is absurd, contradictory, and quite impossible; then the whole of every Soul, is concerned in every voluntary Action; and is accordingly chargeable, and accountable.

But

But some of the free Actions of every fallen human Soul are wicked; this will doubtless be allowed. But then it follows, that in every Instance of a wicked Action, the whole Soul is employed, and chargeable in the Sight of God. Where then is the Room or Place left, for the Inhabitation and Continuance of it's Rectitude? What Part or Power of the Soul remains in it's Allegiance? Where is the Image of God on the Soul now? And if this must be so, in every Instance of a sinful Action, then 'twas so in the first sinful Action. And so the Conclusion follows; that then the whole of the Image of God was lost; and the whole human Soul became a Subject of total Depravity, just as evidently as there was any Sin acted at all.

3. If the Nature of Sin itself is considered, we shall find the same Conclusion supported. For, if it be asked, what is Sin? Let a divine Oracle reply. 1 John iii. 4. "Sin is the Transgression of the Law." Not of a Part of the Law; but every Thing that is Sin, even down to the most transient wicked Thought, is a Transgression of the whole divine Law; for the holy Law is as uniform as the Nature of it's divine Author and Original. A well-known and allowed human Authority also saith, "Sin is any Want of Conformity to—the Law of God." See *Assen. of Div.* Not a great Want, or a partial Want, but any Want whatever, of Conformity to the holy Law, is Sin. Therefore the Apostle saith, Rom. vi. 23. "The Wages of Sin is Death." He saith not this of some Sins only, of great Sins, or of Sin in some Cases; but of Sin, as such, in every Circumstance and Degree of it. The Wages of *all Sin* is Death. And if this Death, and the Likeness of the living God, as such, cannot consist; then wherever there is any Sin, Rectitude is totally wanting.

Further. It will be allowed, that human Nature had Rectitude, and therein Likeness to God once. It will also be allowed, that this was a great Privilege; a rich Endowment. It will doubtless also be granted, that this Privilege was received before it could be merited. Bounty therefore was the Source of it. But then *Abuse* will doubtless incur a Forfeiture. And so it follows,

either that Sin was no Abuse of such favourable and rich Endowment, and so demerited no Loss of it; and then the Loss of it, (for some Loss of Reftitude is allowed on all Sides,) was an Instance of mere arbitrary Dominion; and is a just Object of Complaint against the Deity, by all Generations ever since; and will furnish Matter of fair Exculpation at the last Day; if the grand Assize shall proceed by Rules of Justice; all of which is most arrogant and shocking! Or else, the contrary is true, *viz.* that Sin in its Nature, is the highest Abuse of that divine Endowment, and so makes a natural and necessary Forfeiture of the whole of it. Consequently, no Trace of it can remain; but all Mankind, if they are allowed to be Transgressors, in Consequence of the Fall, are disfranchised; and every Part of the above-named Privilege and Endowment is totally confiscate. And so we have another View and Evidence of the Depravity in Question.

Nay, if Sin is Treason against the King of Kings, and every Privilege, Life, Liberty, Property, and all, is forfeit by Treason in every Kingdom; then either Mankind are not chargeable with such Treason; which Nobody dares affirm; or else, there is not one moral Privilege or Quality, as such, remains in them. And so the Depravity we seek, appears again.

Once more. The divine Wisdom and Conduct, in the whole of Christianity, are subject to high Impeachments, if any Part of this Hypothesis is given up. For if any Degree of Grace or Truth, is still remaining in fallen Men, why came *all Grace and Truth* by Jesus Christ? If any Rightness at all of the moral Kind, was in the Objects of his Advent; why brought He *a perfect Righteousness*? How could it be said, that the Redeemer brought *Life and Immortality to Light*; if Men were not otherwise in perfect Darkness, as to them? How is *all our Sufficiency of God*, if every Degree and Possibility thereof, is not totally wanting in ourselves? How can *all our Springs* be in him, if any of them remain in us? How is he the Object of *all Praise*, if the Reason of all Praise is not in him? If Jesus Christ is not *the Beginning and*

and the End of every scriptural Operation and Effect in the Hearts of Men; how comes He by that absolute Stile? If he does not effect every Degree of the Christian Salvation, in all who have it, how is it ascribed to him? If any good Thing at all, of the moral Kind, is of us; then all Things are not of him. But if the Scriptural Testimony of all these Things must be avowed, then we must hold ourselves the necessitous Objects of such complete and all sufficient Relief, as coming by Jesus Christ only; and that merely as an Effect of Grace. Then we hold ourselves, and Gospel Truth and Grace, in the same Point of Light in which the Bible puts them. Otherwise, we deny the most evident Truth of both, and make God a Liar in the whole of the two leading Characters in all divine Révelation, viz. those of God and Man.

Lastly. To all these may be added, a Discrimination and Evidence of the moral State of fallen Men, taken from the abstract Words and Expressions which are used about it in the Bible. Abstract Words, as Mr. Lock saith, convey the Idea of Essences; and shew the entire Essence of the Things they describe abstractly, without any Mixture or Connection. *Righteousness*, is an Instance; it describes the Essence of Rightness, or being right; and admits no Degree of Mixture or Connection in it's Nature, with any other Nature. And so different abstract Terms can never affirm one of another; for there is never any Thing can be affirmed of simple Essences, as such, but their own Essence. Concrete Words may affirm or deny about simple Essences. For Instance; Light is sweet; Wickedness is dangerous; Death is terrible, and the like. But the Bible joins no concrete Words or Notions with those abstract ones, whereby it describes Man's original State, or fallen State; or State of Recovery by Jesus Christ, as such. Because they are each entire, distinct, and without any Mixture. So the Notion of Righteousness, Innocency, Holiness, Uprightness, &c. are used for being *abstractly right*. And as Characterisms of the original human State, exclude all Notion of Mixture. So Words which describe the depraved State of Men, in the Bible, are such as these,

these, viz. *Darkness*; not *dark only*, which would imply something of a different Nature to constitute the Essence of such State; but *Darkness itself* in the Abstract, as admitting no mollifying, mitigating, or extenuating Predicate to it's Nature, as characteristic of the human State, respecting moral Light or Knowledge. So Enmity, Wickedness, Unbelief, Guilt, Blindness, Pride, Hardness, Death, and an endless Train of the like Sort, are used to shew the entire and unmixed Nature of what they import, as making the Character of the fallen human State. And to shew that the Redeemer finds Men such; and does, out of his own Fulness, impart all the Relief they do, or ever can receive; his Mercy and all its Efficacies, are described by like abstract Expressions: As Light, Life, Truth, Mercy, Peace, Righteousness, Salvation, &c. Nay, the moral Change itself is styled Creation and Resurrection in the Abstract.

So, if he who speaks nothing amiss, is allowed to be the Author of this remarkable Sort of Phraseology in these Cases, throughout the Scripture, 'tis, doubtless, because in the first human State, there was nothing but abstract Righteousness; which is the true Notion of the Image of God: And because in the depraved State of Men, there is nothing but Darkness, Ignorance, Wickedness, and Death, to form their moral Character. Which for the present closeth the Evidence, about what is the Depravity in Question.

Now we may see how fallen human Nature must be affected, to the divine Nature and Character, as perfectly holy. That human Nature was well affected to the divine Nature and Character, when moral Likeness subsisted between those Natures, is out of all Doubt. But since no moral Likeness to the divine Nature remains in fallen Men, as has been proved, it must follow, that either Contraries, and that even of the moral Kind, such as Holiness and Wickedness, Knowledge and Ignorance, Purity and Pollution, &c. can take Complacence in each other, which is obviously impossible. Or else, the divine Nature and Character are altered, as well as the human; which is blasphemous to suppose.

suppose. Or lastly, that the human Nature is in a State of total Disaffection to the divine Character, and to every View of his Nature and Perfections, as exhibited in the gospel System. And that indeed it is so, will further appear by the following Sketches of Demonstration, viz.

1. Human Nature is at present, in a State of either Love or Hatred to the Deity; but moral Likeness, which is the natural Reason of Love, and without some Degree of which, there can be no Love of the moral Kind, is totally lost; and Unlikeness in the moral Sense, which is the natural Reason of Aversion, has took Place, as has been proved, and as it necessarily must in fallen moral Creatures; therefore there is no Love in a fallen human Creature, as such, to the Deity, but a total Disaffection.

The Way to evade this Argument, must be to prove, either that the above Demonstrations of our fallen State, are not founded in Truth; or that there is no such natural Contrariety between the Righteousness of God, and the Wickedness of Men, as is pretended; or lastly, that in Spite of every Thing founded in the Nature of Things to the contrary, 'tis true in Fact, that fallen Men, previous to the moral Change, do love God, delight in his Character, obey his Will, please him, and are accepted of him. But if neither of these can be proved, we may rest in the Evidence we have, of universal moral Depravity, Loss of all moral Likeness to God, in human Nature, and such total Disaffection to every divine Object, as holy; as we find and know to be exemplified in Facts every Moment.

2. If every Faculty and Power of every human Soul, is somehow chargeable with the Guilt of every one of it's wicked Actions, as has been proved; then either some Likeness, and some Love to the divine Nature does consist with, and still remain in, such wicked and guilty Subject, directly contrary to the Nature of Things, and the above Evidences; or else, by means of such Sin and Guilt, no such Likeness or Love can be there, but the Soul is left destitute of both, and so in a State of total Disaffection to all divine Objects, as the Bible reveals them.

That the former cannot be, is obvious enough; and that the latter can be, yea more, that it must of Necessity be so, has been proved above. Therefore, just as evidently as the divine Nature and Wickedness are Opposites, so evident it is that there is no Love to the divine Character in a fallen human Creature, as such.

That a fallen human Creature, previous to the moral Change, may have a Taste, of some Sort or other; and actually, for some Reason or other, have a Veneration for Things that are right, lovely, and of good Report, in some Sense; and Aversion to the contrary, is evident. And 'tis observable among the darkeſt Pagans, as well as in Chriſtendom. And 'tis as manifest, that it is a *natural Property of moral Being*. 'Tis one of those Things which distinguish a rational Nature, and proceeds on the natural Principle, by which *every Like loves it's Like*. But to say, that this proves Love to the divine Character, in the Sense of Revelation, as manifest in such Cases, implies, either that the Love of ourselves, and the Love of God are the same Thing; for to love our Like, because it is such, is Self-love; or else, that such laudable Things as we have a Liking for naturally, are of the same Nature with the divine Character, and are viewed and liked as such. To suppose the latter, not only implies, that all Men, even the wildest Heathen, do love the divine Character, though they never heard or thought of it, in a Bible Light; and that they love Things virtuous and honest, because they love God, of whom they have never heard, in the Christian Sense: But it also implies, that there is no natural Difference, between natural Virtue in Men and the divine Character, as exhibited in the Bible; and so what gives Character to the naturally virtuous, as such, among Men, gives Character to God; and so indeed he is become as altogether one like ourselves. And by such means, we are making large Strides toward the old Sainring-Age again, and may soon expect to hear of Confirmations issued for some of the first Virtuſos among us.

3. If all moral Contrarieties in moral Beings, import as much Disaffection subsisting between them, as there is of such Contrariety

riety in them ; then, either there is no such Contrariety in Men to the divine Nature, the contrary to which has been proved ; or such Contrariety possesseth them but in Part ; the Reverse of which has also been proved ; or else they are, as moral Beings, full of such Contrariety, as has been proved ; and so as full of Disaffection to the divine Nature and Character.

This is just as evident, as that Righteousness and Wickedness, (the known Characters of God and Man,) are such Contrarieties.

4. There can be no Love without a Will to love ; and there can be no Will to love the divine Character, without Understanding, or mental Sight of it's Beauty and Loveliness ; and there can be no such Understanding, or Sight, previous to the moral Change : Therefore, previous to the moral Change, there can be no Love, *i. e.* nothing but Disaffection to that divine Character.

No Part of this Argument can be denied, except that which affirms total Blindness to divine Beauty before Regeneration. And to deny this, induceth a Necessity to deny the Nature of Things in the Case ; for what Need of Regeneration to one who is already in Sight and Knowledge, and so in the Love of Divine Beauty ? Induceth also the Necessity of denying our fallen State ; For how is he fallen, who lives in the Sight, and so in the Love of divine Beauties ? Lastly, it induceth a Necessity of denying the Truth of the Bible, which in numerous Instances affirms total Blindness in all Men naturally to the moral Beauties of the divine Nature.

5. The Will always chuseth or refuseth, and is excited thereto by such Motives as the Understanding presents : If then, previous to the moral Change, the Understanding can present no right View of the divine Character, as to be sure it cannot, if it is totally depraved, as has been proved ; the Will, in that Case, must either chuse, and so exercise Love to the divine Character, as an Object of it's Complacence, without any moral Motive thereto ; *i. e.* without the Understanding's having any Sight or Knowledge of it's Beauty ; which would be to chuse without any Reason

for of Choice, which is an Absurdity; or else, it must always, previous to the moral Change, refuse the divine Character, as an Object of Complacence, the Understanding having no Sight of it's Beauty; and so always exercise the Reverse of Love to it, which is Disaffection. And as the Cause is, so must the Effect be; but the Cause is total Darkness in the Understanding, as to the Beauty of the divine Character, without any Intermision: Therefore the Effect must be, that the Will in all it's Actions, respecting that Object, refuseth it, as in it's own Nature an Object of Complacence. And if a constant and total refusing is Demonstration of equal Disaffection, then all Men, previous to the moral Change, are constantly and totally disaffected to such divine Character.

6. That Hypothesis is to be admitted in this Case, which most obviously vindicates the Righteousness of God, the Truth of the Scriptures, and is supported by Facts well known to common Sense. For the Bible was not primarily calculated for sublime Philosophers, sour Cavillers, or sensual Hypocrites; but for the plain Subjects of common Sense. Now this Bible harps much on the Righteousness of God, and on the universal Wickedness of fallen Men, as such; affirms fearful Anger and most tremendous Wrath, to be in God against them; abundantly denieth all moral Goodness, and Favour of God to them, while unregenerate; always maintains both the divine Nature, and his Law, to be holy, just, and good; and all Men to be naturally at Enmity with both. And the inspired Word for this Enmity is, *Echthra*. Rom. viii. 7. which is derived from *Echthra*, Hatred.

Now, if to suppose, that the original Author of this System did first make it known with such total Disaffection, as is now contended for, full in his Eye, renders his Character and the System itself, more obviously consistent, than the contrary Hypothesis: Nay, if the contrary Hypothesis tends to sap the very Foundation of such a Revelation, and to render it needless, and in a great Measure useless; and tends to render the perfect Righteousness of the divine Nature, and the moral Ruin of the human

human, more confused, dark and doubtful, if not quite absurd and inconsistent; then the Doctrine of total Disaffection, &c. is true Doctrine; but the former is true, and so of Course must be the latter.

'Tis evident beyond all Contradiction, that the Bible is calculated for fallen depraved Creatures; and it has been proved, that if men are depraved at all, as both Sides in this Debate allow, then they are totally depraved. Two Things are evidently essential, in a revealed System of Mercy, for Creatures totally depraved. One is, that they are hopelessly shut up under Guilt and Wrath, in every other Point of View; or else, there is no absolute Need of such Revelation, and so to make it, would be doing something in vain, which God never does. The other is, that every Requisite, to certain and complete Salvation, is provided in such System. That the Bible is remarkable for both these, cannot be denied. Of Course, either it was given, with such total Depravity and Disaffection, as is now contended for, full in the Eye of the Donor; or else it was very improperly calculated, and so the Wisdom and Righteousness of it's Author is impeached; and so we are shut up, either to admit this shocking Consequence! or, to avoid it, allow the total Disaffection.

7. And lastly. If a totally depraved Nature, is totally different in moral Respects, from a Nature totally right in all Respects; and if such right Nature is only found in God, and if his Character is just like his Nature; then such depraved Nature must be in total Disaffection, both to the Nature and Character of God: But it is so totally different, therefore totally disaffected. This is just as evident, as that Contraries can't agree; which is most of all evident in moral Contrarieties, as has been shewed.

Now let us address ourselves to see, by what Power the moral Change must be wrought, in Creatures so totally depraved, and disaffected.

But as it is allowed, that it must be by either moral or physical Power; it may first be asked, what is moral Power, and what is physical Power?

H

The

The Answer is, there is exactly no Difference between the moral Power of God, and his physical Power, considered *as Power*. The Difference lies altogether in what is extraneous to Power, as such.

For Instance. Moral Power, as such, operates by moral Means, in a moral Manner, to moral Purposes; and so comes to be stiled moral Power. But physical Power, as such, never operates by such Means, or in such a Manner. Indeed it produceth natural Effects, and must be the Original of all moral Effects, because Omnipotence is the Source of all Power. Now though physical Power as such, never useth moral Means, nor ever operates in a moral Manner; yet the Effects produced by it may be, and sometimes certainly are *wholly moral*; if not, either there is no Power in the Deity, but moral Power, as such; and then whence came *Creation*? And whence can come a *Resurrection*? or else there are no moral Effects produced at all, contrary to all Knowledge. Or else, lastly, there are two distinct Sorts of Power, in that natural, uncompounded Principle of the divine Nature, viz. Power; which is absurd enough. Well then, the first Cause of moral Effects is physical Power, as such, and never can be otherwise.

To say by Way of Objection, that the Deity has moral Reasons, by which he is moved to such Acts of his Power, when he produceth first moral Effects, is to say nothing to the Purpose; because Reasons to act, are not Efficients of the Act, but Efficiency remains, and is a distinct Thing, from Reasons and Motives thereto. Beside, either the most high has moral Reasons for all his Acts of physical Power, that we know of, or else they are not all done with Design ultimately, to secure Honour to his moral Perfections; or to serve moral Purposes among the Creatures; and so all his Views could never centre in the Redeemer of Men, as such; nor could he be quite well pleased in the Morality of his Son; nor could his tender Mercies be over all his Works.

If

If then moral Effects, as such, must have derived first of all from the Efficacy of a physical Cause, there is no natural Absurdity, in supposing a moral Effect, to proceed from a physical Cause. And of Course, no Absurdity in supposing the moral Change to be wrought by physical Power.

Beside, if human Nature is so totally depraved, as is proved above, then there are no more Materials, for any Sort of divine Power to use, belonging to the Person to be changed, to begin right Morality with, than there were for creating Power to use in the Beginning; or than there will be for raising Power to use in raising the Dead. But both those are allowed to be the Work of physical Power, as such; therefore so must that be, which effects the moral Change.

Again, if there is such a total Disaffection to all divine Objects as such, in every Person to be changed, as has been proved; then either Disaffection must help a little, in effecting the moral Change, directly counter to it's Nature; which would be to destroy the Difference between *willing* and *nilling*, and to make direct Opposites, to become the same in Effect; or else physical Power alone must do the Work.

Nay, if there is any right Morality in the Person to be changed, before the moral Change; then there is no Need of a moral Change; but only of Improvement, Increase and Growth. But both Sides in this Argument, insist, that there must be a moral Change. Now the Point is, how shall true Morality begin, in the Soul totally destitute of it? If we say, as every Thing else begins, viz. by physical Power, the Account is rational, consistent with the Nature of Things, and with the Word of God. And such as would not have a moral Change, so wrought, must doubtless go destitute of it, 'till total Depravity begins to transform into Righteousness, and total Disaffection into Love; or 'till something begins to operate without actual Existence; and a moral Effect takes Place without any Sort of Causality; or 'till nothing becomes something of it's own Accord.

Now

Now no one among Men can be blamed, for not understanding the Mode of the Operation of a physical Cause, as such, in producing any Effect, *nam solo Deo competit*; "none can by searching find out God." Yet we know that first Causes, as such, must be physical Causes, as plainly as we know, that some Cause must first give Being to every Thing that is begun. And though Morality itself can have no Beginning, yet the Principle of it in a totally depraved Creature, may be begun; and it must be without any Help from such Creature, for nothing can give what it has not got.

But still, 'tis said, the moral Change may be wrought by *suasion*. But if there is no Principle or Degree of Suasibility, in the Soul that is to be changed, as certainly there is not, by what we have found already; then there is nothing for the suasive Mean to act on; no Way for it to take Hold of the Soul, in the suasive Way; and so the Soul, in that Case, is to the supposed suasive Mean, just as *nothing* is to *something*. And if *nothing* has no Qualities, then this Subject of the supposed Operation, not having any right moral Quality in it, to render it ductile to such Influence, *is not suasive*, by any Power whatever. And so 'tis *not possible*, that any moral Power whatever, as such, should begin to change it.

Beside, *Suasion* operates only by giving the Mind some influencing View. Now if such View is not of the right moral Kind, it can never effect the moral Change; because the supposed Influence is of a contrary Tendency; for there is no Medium between right and wrong in the moral Sense. *Et Contrarium e Contrario exsurgere non potest*. And to suppose any right View, in the moral Sense, to take Place in the Understanding, where it must be, if any where, to serve the proposed Purpose, is attended with the following Difficulties, *viz.*

1. It supposeth the Understanding to be possessed of a morally right View, and so to have some divine Light, and Knowledge of the Truth, as it is in Jesus; which is the very Thing, as to that

that Faculty of the Soul, that is, *sub Judice*, or yet in Dispute; and so it is begging the Question.

2. It supposeth the Understanding actually possessed of what we have above proved, it is impossible it should be susceptible of, before the moral Change; for it has been proved to be in the State which the Bible calls "dead in Sin." And as it is impossible in Nature, for the Dead to conceive, or apprehend Means by which to rise, so this Supposition is inconsistent with the Nature of Things.

3. It supposeth the suasive View to exist in, and influence the Mind, respecting the moral Change, while the same Mind is yet not changed, *i. e.* while it is wholly a Subject of the reigning Power and Influence of Sin and Death; and doubtless these two Sorts of Influence are contrary to each other; and so the Supposition makes the same Mind subject to two directly opposite, inconsistent, and incompatible Sorts of actual Influence, at the same Time.

4. If the supposed suasive View, does not affect, or move the Mind at all, it never can effect the proposed Change; this is obvious. And if it does affect or move the Mind about the Change, which is beginning to change, then the Mind is in the Change in order to begin to change; it is turning in order to begin to turn; 'tis contemplating divine Truth, in order to begin to have Knowledge of it. This is something like a Person's begetting himself; and is fitter for an Object of Banter, than of sober Reply.

5. And lastly. As no more than one Object of Apprehension, can ever employ the Mind at once, however quick such Objects may succeed one another; and as every such Object must employ the whole of it, for the Time being; so if that Object is such a right moral View, in the Understanding, as is proposed for a Mean of Suasion in this Case; then, for that Instant, that Faculty of the Mind is totally taken up with, and full of *a right View*; full of the right Sort of Light and Knowledge. For the whole Business of the Understanding is to understand. So an Understanding, which in some Part or Degree, is not employed in understanding

derstanding, is just the same, so far forth, as no Understanding: Therefore whatever Object occupieth the Understanding at all, must for that Time fill it full, or employ the whole of it. And when this Object is some right View, and so for that Juncture the Understanding is wholly taken^{up} with, and full of a right Sort of Object; then of Course the Understanding is as right, as the same Faculty was in Innocence, or as that of Gabriel is now. So then, the very Conception of the proposed Mean of Suasion, in order to effect the Change in the moral Way, is *Demonstration*, that the Change, as far as it respects the Understanding, is *already past*. 'Tis changed, as much as an Understanding can be, in order to begin to be changed. 'Tis quite right, in order to begin to become so. This Understanding is in right State now, by the simple Conception of the Mean of Suasion, before the suasive Influence takes Place. But 'tis said, this is only in order to effect a Change. But as there are but two Notions of moral State, and we have just attended the Understanding into the last of these *without Suasion*; what therefore is that other State into which it is to migrate by Suasion?

This brings to View another Absurdity attending the Supposition of the moral Change being wrought by Suasion, viz. That it not only supposeth the right Sort of Activity and Life, actually existing in the Mind, and employed to lay its own Foundation, and to give Being to itself there; but it confounds the Efficiency, by which the Change is said to be wrought, with that of spiritual Edification ever after. And so destroys the Difference between that creating and raising Power, as to the Manner of it's Operation, by which a Soul is created in Christ Jesus, or raised from Death to Life in him; and that by which it is nourished, and preserved in such Life, after it is so created and raised.

When the Principle of the divine Life is begotten, and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Truth, is laid in the Soul, it is become ductile to moral Suasion. A Principle of Suasibility is planted there; in Reference to which the Lord saith, "*my Sheep hear my Voite.*" The Apostle also saith of this Wisdom, "*'tis*
easy

easy to be entreated." Which Things are not true of those who are dead in Sin, and whose Ears are yet deaf that they cannot hear. So it appears from the Word of God, the Nature of the Case, and constant Facts, that Suasion is the Mean of all edifying and growing Influence, to such as are already born of God. But to suppose the Change itself, to be wrought by Suasion, implieth that the Mind, however depraved and disaffected, as has been proved, is yet alive, and naturally ductile to the best Sort of Motives; and so can as well be persuaded, to rise from the Dead, and come to Life, as it can chuse the Good, and refuse the Evil, after it has known them by Experience.

But it may be said, this Argument proves too much. For if the first Apprehensions of divine Things, in their true Sense, must be caused by physical Power; then the same Notion of Power must be employed to recover divine Views, as often as they are absent. For no particular Views can always abide in the Mind. And so the Use of Suasion, is as much excluded, by this Argument, from it's edifying Influence, which is allowed in it, as from it's regenerating Influence, which it pretends to deny.

Ans. This Objection proceeds on the Supposition that physical Power is only employed in causing right Views to exist in the Understanding, which is not true. For the Understanding itself, with every other Power of the Soul, is changed, and brought into a new moral State; being *renewed*—after the Image of him who created it. Col. iii. 10. And the whole is equally the Effect of the same Notion of Power, for Reasons already given; and to which others will soon be added.

Beside, as physical Power is only employed, (respecting Mankind) where moral Motives, in the divine Sense, cannot obtain, which is the Case universally, as to the moral Change, as has been proved. So there is no Reason for the Intervention of Power physical in recovering absent Views of divine Objects; it being otherwise plentifully provided for.

The moral Empire among Men has divers established Means of use, in this Affair, beside mere Suasion. Such as,

1. The

derstanding, is just the same, so far forth, as no Understanding: Therefore whatever Object occupieth the Understanding at all, must for that Time fill it full, or employ the whole of it. And when this Object is some right View, and so for that Juncture the Understanding is wholly taken with, and full of a right Sort of Object; then of Course the Understanding is as right, as the same Faculty was in Innocence, or as that of Gabriel is now. So then, the very Conception of the proposed Mean of Suasion, in order to effect the Change in the moral Way, is *Demonstration*, that the Change, as far as it respects the Understanding, is *already past*. 'Tis changed, as much as an Understanding can be, in order to begin to be changed. 'Tis quite right, in order to begin to become so. This Understanding is in right State now, by the simple Conception of the Mean of Suasion, before the suasive Influence takes Place. But 'tis said, this is only in order to effect a Change. But as there are but two Notions of moral State, and we have just attended the Understanding into the last of these *without Suasion*; what therefore is that other State into which it is to migrate by Suasion?

This brings to View another Absurdity attending the Supposition of the moral Change being wrought by Suasion, viz. That it not only supposeth the right Sort of Activity and Life, actually existing in the Mind, and employed to lay its own Foundation, and to give Being to itself there; but it confounds the Efficiency, by which the Change is said to be wrought, with that of spiritual Edification ever after. And so destroys the Difference between that creating and raising Power, as to the Manner of it's Operation, by which a Soul is created in Christ Jesus, or raised from Death to Life in him; and that by which it is nourished, and preserved in such Life, after it is so created and raised.

When the Principle of the divine Life is begotten, and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Truth, is laid in the Soul, it is become ductile to moral Suasion. A Principle of Suasibility is planted there; in Reference to which the Lord saith, "*my Sheep hear my Voice.*" The Apostle also saith of this Wisdom, "*'tis*
easy

easy to be entreated." Which Things are not true of those who are dead in Sin, and whose Ears are yet deaf that they cannot hear. So it appears from the Word of God, the Nature of the Case, and constant Facts, that Suasion is the Mean of all edifying and growing Influence, to such as are already born of God. But to suppose the Change itself, to be wrought by Suasion, implieth that the Mind, however depraved and disaffected, as has been proved, is yet alive, and naturally ductile to the best Sort of Motives; and so can as well be persuaded, to rise from the Dead, and come to Life, as it can chuse the Good, and refuse the Evil, after it has known them by Experience.

But it may be said, this Argument proves too much. For if the first Apprehensions of divine Things, in their true Sense, must be caused by physical Power; then the same Notion of Power must be employed to recover divine Views, as often as they are absent. For no particular Views can always abide in the Mind. And so the Use of Suasion, is as much excluded, by this Argument, from it's edifying Influence, which is allowed in it, as from it's regenerating Influence, which it pretends to deny.

Ans. This Objection proceeds on the Supposition that physical Power is only employed in causing right Views to exist in the Understanding, which is not true. For the Understanding itself, with every other Power of the Soul, is changed, and brought into a new moral State; being *renewed*—after the Image of him who created it. Col. iii. 10. And the whole is equally the Effect of the same Notion of Power, for Reasons already given; and to which others will soon be added.

Beside, as physical Power is only employed, (respecting Mankind) where moral Motives, in the divine Sense, cannot obtain, which is the Case universally, as to the moral Change, as has been proved. So there is no Reason for the Intervention of Power physical in recovering absent Views of divine Objects; it being otherwise plentifully provided for.

The moral Empire among Men has divers established Means of use, in this Affair, beside mere Suasion. Such as,

1. The

1. The reigning Principle of Love to such Objects planted in the Soul, and maintained by it's divine Original.
 2. The natural Power of Reflection and Memory, with which the Mind was endowed by it's Creator. And which remain for constant Use, after the moral Change.
 3. It's native Propensity arising from Pleasure or Pain; a Sense of Interest or Duty; to desire and often exert itself, after Apprehensions, in which it has tasted the Sweets of divine Communion, and to avoid the contrary.
 4. Christian Conversation, on those Things, about which they that fear the Lord speak often one to another.
 5. The Prayer of Faith, in the *certain* and *known Truth*, and free Sufficiency, of the Covenant of Grace.
 6. Daily Meditations on the Scriptures, by which such Views of their Contents, as have been had, will naturally be revived.
- But, 7. The finishing Relief is, that he who has begotten the Soul to a good Hope, through Grace, *knows all about it*; and has engaged to maintain and persevere it, to his heavenly Kingdom. And that *no good Thing* shall be wanting to that End. And for this Purpose has secured the present Efficacies of *the Holy Ghost*, to attend every Subject of this Change, in all Circumstances of Providence, to the End of the World.

There is therefore no Province for physical Power, as such, on the Minds of Men, and in Reference to the moral Empire, in their Hearts; but in causing first Views of divine Objects, and in planting first Principles of true Morality; together with what both necessarily pre-suppose in Creatures so depraved, and disaffected to holy Things, as all Men have been proved to be.

But that these must be the Effect of physical Power, as such, or else never take Place at all, may be determined in the following Manner:

1. If the Scriptures are admitted as a Test in this Affair, then all Men are naturally engrossed in such a State of Darkness, not *only* as a State of Ignorance, but as a State of reigning Immorality, as bars all Hope from moral Power, as such; but the Scriptures

Scriptures must be admitted, for a Test, and they only can be, in Matters which depend on divine Revelation; therefore, all Men are entirely in such a State of moral Darknes, not by Ignorance only, but by being powerfully holden under the actual Dominion of Sin and Satan, as necessarily bars all Hope of Relief from moral Power, as such.

Out of the Multitude of Scriptural Passages, which support this Argument, the Case of the christian Ephesians *only*, will be named at present. Of these, Inspiration has told us, that before their moral Change, *they were Darknes*, in the Abstract. Eph. v. 8. Such therefore was the Nature of their moral State, that as it had no Quality in it, but of this Sort; so it became their proper Characterism.

Now to alledge that this was not said of them, as unregenerate, but as Heathen, is to hold, that Deliverance from Heathenism, is the moral Change. But if being civilized doth not change *the moral State of the Soul*; as is evident enough; then this Example is well chosen.

Now Darknes, in the moral Sense, is not such a negative Thing, as natural Darknes is, *viz.* to consist merely in the Absence of Light. But 'tis positively characteristick of a great and powerful Empire. The Properties of a Kingdom, with numerous Subjects, King, and Laws, are ascribed to it, in the Scriptures. And every unregenerate Person, is considered by the Bible, as a Subject of this Kingdom of Darknes, *ex imo Pectore*. This is charged on these Ephesians. Cap. ii. ver. 2. And 'tis there alledged to be the Case of all Children of Disobedience.

Accordingly we find, these Ephesians, had their Change wrought, *Κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Κρατοῦ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ αὐτοῦ*. Eph. i. 19. *By the Energy of the Might of his Power*; or by the *in-working* of his *Mighty Power*. And this is as high a Description of the Operation of divine Power, as any the Bible gives us. Yea, 'tis declared in the next Words, to be the same as he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the Dead.

Now

Now that there can be no Hope in this Case from moral Power, as such, is as evident as that it is not the *Might of his Power*, by which he raised Christ from the Dead. 'Tis as evident, as that Suasion can never cause Light to shine out of Darkness; or make Life to rise out of Death.

Nay, as this State of Darkness is supported and defended in every one of it's Subjects, by all the Powers of Sin, Death, and Hell; so as Suasion never opposes Power with Power, as such; don't mean to succeed by immediate Conquest; nor to destroy the Works of the mighty Tyrant, *immédiatē sine mediis*, as the Conquests of mere Power must be made; and as the strong Man armed will keep his Hold, 'till Power comes which can destroy his Works, and will judge, and cast him out; so either the moral Change must never be wrought, or wrought by Power physical. Which is that *mighty Power*, whereby the Dead are raised; and Light is made to shine out of Darkness; and to which nothing is impossible. This therefore opens the Door of Hope.

2. If no Power can create but physical Power, as such; then the moral Change is wrought by physical Power, as such; but the former is true; and so of Course, must be the latter. For the moral Change, is that *καὶνὴ κτίσις*, or *new Creation*, of which the Bible so often speaks; as may be seen, 2 Cor. v. 17. Gal. vi. 15, &c.

Now that to create [which in this Case is to give Nature and Being to a new moral State, where it was not before] is the peculiar Work of physical Power, as such, is just as evident as the Meaning of the Expression. Or that there is any Difference between physical and moral Power. For to suppose the contrary is totally to destroy that Difference. Therefore either the moral Change is wrought by no Power, as such, or else 'tis wrought by Power physical.

3. If Light as Light, in the moral Sense, is the only Medium by which moral Power, as such, or Suasion, can operate; then the moral Change is not wrought by moral Power, as such, or by Suasion; but such Light is the only Mean by which moral Power,

Power, as such, or Suasion, can operate: Therefore the moral Change is not wrought by either.

For Light, as such, in the moral Sense, is only a Medium of Vision; 'tis no Efficient of any Thing. Either, therefore, the moral Change is an Effect wrought, without any Efficiency at all; which destroys the natural Notion of Connection, between Causes and Effects; and supposeth that Effects may take Place without any Cause; which is exactly the same, as Effects taking Place, without any Effects taking Place. Or else, the moral Change is solely the Effect of physical Power.

4. If Subjects of total moral Depravity, are totally destitute of Ability, for moral Purposes; then their moral Change, must be wrought by physical Power; but they are totally destitute of such Ability; therefore they must be changed by physical Power, or not be changed at all. For moral Power, never works by Power, as such; but by presenting Motives to the Mind, to excite it's own Ability. But as a Person totally morally depraved has no Ability, at all, for any such Purpose, as the moral Change; so 'tis impossible that moral Power, as such, should do any Thing to it. So the Change must be wrought by physical Power, or else never be wrought at all.

5. If a totally depraved Mind has no christian Virtue, as such; then the moral Change must be wrought by physical Power; but the former is true, and so of Course must be the latter. For it will doubtless be allowed, that all must have Christian Virtue, who have the moral Change; and that the moral Change is the Commencement of Christianity, as such, in the Person changed. But the Point is, how are the Christian Virtues first begotten? To say that they proceed first of all from the suasive Influence of moral Power, is to say they proceed from the Mind, when it has nothing of that Nature in it; and so nothing produceth something. For moral Power only presents suasive Reasons, to move the Mind to exert what is already in itself. To say they proceed from Christian Principles planted in human

human Nature, is either to deny the Necessity of the moral Change, for they who have Christian Principles planted in them, need only Edification, and not the moral Change; or else 'tis confessing that they proceed from Christian Principles planted at the Time of the moral Change, by physical Power; and so it is giving up the Point.

6. If to suppose the moral Change, to be wrought by moral Power, as such, necessarily involves this Absurdity, viz. That the moral Empire, in Believers of the Gospel, derives from, and is dependant on itself; then that Change is not wrought by moral, but physical Power, but the former is true, and so that Change must be wrought by physical Power.

For as all that moral Power, as moral can do, is to excite the moral Abilities, which it finds in the Soul to work upon; and so to quicken and increase the Exercise of the moral Virtues, which are said to be already there. So if all the right moral Principles, Abilities and Virtues, which are ever there, must necessarily belong to the moral Empire in that Soul; then that Excitement of the moral Virtues, which moral Power is supposed to find there, gives Being to the moral Empire, which moral Power is said to commence there. And so the moral Empire derives from, and is dependant for it's Being, on some of it's own Virtues. And so Christianity in those who are changed, is made to depend on those Christian Virtues, which necessarily must derive out of it's own Bowels, for it's Being and Prevalence. But if physical Power, as such, is the Efficient of this Change, then it derives from him who worketh all Things according to the Council of his own Will. And whose Stile is *the Beginning and the End of all Things*.

7. If to be begotten of God, to be born of God, and many such Expressions in the Scripture, mean the moral Change; then it must be the Effect of physical Power; but to be begotten of God; &c. does mean the moral Change; therefore 'tis wrought by physical Power. The Minor in this Argument is supported by John i. 13. Which sheweth that those who receive Jesus Christ,

Christ, and become Sons of God, are born—not of the Will of Man, but of God. Also by John iii. 3, 5. Shewing that the Change without which no Man can see the Kingdom of God; is a Being born *anew*, from above, and is the Efficiency of the Almighty Spirit, &c. And 'tis just as evident to common Sense that this Efficiency is physical, as that the first Notion of begetting is natural; or that the Propagation of Creatures is never performed by Rhetorick, or Suasion.

If it is objected, that the Corinthians were begotten through the Gospel. The Answer is, Paul addresseth them as a visible Church. 1 Cor. i. 2. And that they were begotten to that visible Standing in Gospel Obedience, by the suasive Influence of the Gospel, is plain enough; for Suasion is the standing Mean of christian Obedience; as has been shewed.

But if any should still imagine that the Word *begotten*, in this Text must be understood as in those above, 'tis answered by saying,

1. To beget, in the Sense of the Objection, by Suasion, is a natural Impossibility, as has been shewed.

2. Therefore if the Word *begotten*, in the Text in Question, means the moral Change; it was effected by the Doctrine of the Gospel, as the Resurrection of Lazarus was, when Gospel Words were spoken over his Corpse; and the like in many other Instances. But every Body knows these Facts were effected by physical, and not by moral Power, as such.

3. If the Will is never moved by determining Dictates of the Understanding, but is moved by the Understanding, only as by a moral Motive; or as shewing what is best to be willed; then the moral Change must be wrought by physical Power.

Now that the Will is never moved by any determining Dictates of the Understanding, is just as evident as that Understanding and Will are different; for a determining Dictate, is an act of Volition, or of the Will. And so for the Will to be determined by such Dictate, would be, for it to be determined by itself; which is impossible. Therefore the Will is moved by the

L

Understand.

Understanding, only as by a moral Motive; or as shewing what is best to be willed. But in order that the Understanding should so move the Will, as to Things rightly moral, it must have right Views of Morality, to present to the Will, as eligible; or else it must present them without having them; and so give what it has not got.

It must then have such right Views; and it must have them, *ab extra*; for as totally depraved, it has none of it's own. Now to suppose moral Power, as such, to beget them there, is to suppose some right moral Object, to be seen by the Understanding, in order to it's being seen by the Understanding.

Something must cure the depraved State of the Understanding, in order that right Views may take Place there. And as moral Suasion begets nothing, but only moves to Action, what is already there; so, if the Matter is managed in the moral Way, the Understanding must have right Morality in it already, in order to receive the first Impression of moral Influence. Or else this moral Power, effects the Change, as to the Understanding, without shewing one Whit of Morality; which is exactly the same Thing, as for it to be done by physical Power; and so the Distinction of the two Notions of Power is destroyed; and the Point in Dispute is given up.

9. That all Men are naturally wholly disaffected to holy Things, as such, has been proved. Which is that Enmity which the Scriptures teach, and Experience proves, to have infested all Men, against the Kingdom of God, as a Kingdom of Evangelical Truth. And 'tis as evident from the Nature of the Case, and from the Word of God, that this Enmity is unconvertible. The inspired Word for this Enmity, imports Hatred, as has been shewed; and the original Word for the same Thing, when it is rendered *alienated*, is *απηλωτριωμενοι*, Eph. iv. 18. From *απο*, and *αλλο*. Importing, to be quite other Persons, in the Temper of Mind, and State of Affections, from what is right. The divine Sense of it may be seen, Eph. ii. 12. Shewing that when they were Gentiles, in the Flesh, they were without Christ,

Aliens

Aliens from the Common Wealth of Israel; Strangers to the Covenants of Promise, having no Hope, and without God in the World. Their Relief was totally, by the Blood of Christ. xlii. 6. But if 'tis wrought by any Use primarily made of Powers or Qualities in the Soul to be changed, as it is, if done in the moral Way; then there is some good and useful Qualification in the Unregenerate, serving to help forward their Regeneration. There is a genuine Suasibility in them already. Contrary to what has been proved above. But then, how can Truth ascribe the whole Deliverance to some divine Virtue in the Blood of Christ? For if any Reason, or Mean of Salvation is in us, then the whole is not of Christ, or mere Grace.

The same Word is also used, Col. i, 21. where it is coupled with *ἔχθρας τῇ διαβολῇ*. *Enemies in every Faculty of the Mind; or, in every reasoning Exercise of the Mind.* And their Change is expressed by *ἀποκατήλλαχεν*. From *ἀπο κατὰ* and *ἄλλῃ*. He hath changed you, altogether away from what ye were. Which, considering what they were, must be as it is rendered, *reconciled*.

So either in a State of total Enmity, the Mind is not so totally disaffected, as not to have any right moral Principle, for moral Power, as such, to take hold upon, in order to influence the other Parts of the Soul, [for on this Scheme we must speak so] and so effect the Change; or else physical Power, as such, must first stay the Enmity, destroy the Alienation, and create the Soul anew in Christ Jesus: But in such a State of total Enmity, as all Men have been proved to be in by Nature, the Mind is so totally disaffected, as not to have any Thing for moral Power, as such, to take hold on, in order to influence and effect the Change: Therefore either physical Power, as such, must do the Work, or must never be done.

10. And lastly. If the Scripture Doctrine, of the Unregenerate, being dead in Sin, means that they are as unable to any Thing morally right in the Sense of Christianity, as Persons naturally dead, are to natural, or civil Action; then physical Power, as such, is as necessary to raise the Soul to such right
Morality

Morality, as to raise the Body at the last Day: But that Scripture Doctrine does mean so by it's own Explanations; therefore physical Power, is as necessary in the one Case as in the other. And this is exactly according to the Bible's Account of the whole Affair. And renders every Part of the Bible's Scheme most obviously consistent.

Among the many Things which rise to View, by the foregoing Remarks, a few only will be named. Scil.

1. Then the moral State of all Men, whatever are their other Characters, or Distinctions, is very deplorable, 'till they are created anew in Christ Jesus. They are fallen from God, have lost his Image, are unclean before the Eyes of divine Purity. Not one of them has any Thing in him that is right, and well-pleasing in his Sight. They are under the Dominion of the Flesh: in hearty Opposition to the revealed Nature of Jehovah; and never please him *in any Thing they do*, Rom. viii. 5—8. Not one Ray of Gospel Glory do they ever see. None of the Beauties of the once dying, now risen and reigning Friend, do they behold. Nay, they cannot know them, because they are spiritually discerned. 1 Cor. ii. 14. They are all blind, and see not why he should be desired. He calls, but their Heart refuses. He has lift up his golden Sceptre, but their Neck is an Iron Sinew. He is the chief of ten Thousands, but other Lords have Dominion over them. His Wrath is revealed from Heaven, but they dare to run the Risque. He tells them every Day they shall not escape, but they despise his Councils, and will have none of his Reproofs. He speaks from Heaven, but there is none that understandeth; none that seeketh after God. Rom. iii. 10—18. Their guilty State, and it's impending Ruin, are set before the Eyes of natural Reason and Conscience, in the plainest, and most affecting Manner; but their Heart says, depart from us, we desire not the Knowledge of thy Ways; present Pardon, divine Peace, and endless Bliss, are brought exceeding near. The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto them. The first Robe, the fatted Calf, the golden Ring, yea all Things are ready; and
Mercy

Mercy cries, "come ye to the Marriage; but one is for his Field, another for his Merchandize. Though the Lord declares daily, that in those Ways, they shall never taste of his Supper; but be cast out for ever, where is weeping and gnashing of Teeth. Where the Worm dies not, and the Fire never shall be quenched.

2. Then what is wanting is not natural, but moral Ability. Ye will not come to me that ye might have Life, is the Accusation of all that love not the Lord Jesus Christ in Sincerity, John v. 40. Not one natural Faculty of the Soul in original Innocence is wanting; but all remain compleat; only thoroughly distempered with malignant Hatred. Every ungodly Soul on Earth, from the highest Prince, to the lowest Servant that is behind the Mill, agree in this, that there is no Form, or Comeliness in him. But this as evidently riseth from their perverted Taste, as that the despised Object, is the most divine Immanuel. Salvation's wanting, only for Want of Love; for he that loveth is of God. 1 John iv. 7. Total Disaffection to every holy Object maintains the guilty Bondage. The Language of their Heart is, "I want some more sensual Enjoyments; a little longer to please my Taste, and gratify myself. I can't give up my self-righteous Hope so soon; I don't love that crucified Jesus; I don't delight in his holy Word; his Service looks like Slavery, don't disturb me yet." So Men eat the Fruit of their own Ways, and are answered according to their Idols.

3. Then 'tis vain for such as profess to militate the Empire of Darkness, and this moral Death, to attempt it by the Halves; and so implicitly offer to compound with Men, on lower Terms than the Bible does. Preachers, or other Professors, have no Guide at all, in Matters of true Religion, but the Bible; and if they don't conduct and speak, according to the Letter of that Directory, they pay the same Regard to Custom, Fancy, or Delusion, which is due only to the Word of God. To the Law, and to the Testimony, if they speak not according to this Word,

it is because there is no Light in them. Isa. viii. 20. Now this Word, no where directs it's Heralds, to publish other Terms of Peace, any other Mean of Acceptation, than is expressly set forth in the Letter of the divine Charter. If they give Hope of Favour, on Account of natural Decency, Innocence and Sweetness of Temper and Manners, they stand condemned by their own Bibles. For, notwithstanding these, unsanctified Souls are Subjects of Wrath still, even as others. If they give Hope of Safety to the awakened, the reformed, or serious Legalist, their Book condemns them, by saying, no Righteousness shall be mentioned in that affair, but the divine only. Psal. lxxi. 16. If antinomian Faith is fostered; the forbidding Word is, "not by Faith only." Jam. ii. 24. If Men are set to work for Life; nay, to shed a Tear, or make a Prayer, with Hope to escape some Judgment, or smoothe the frowning Brow of Wrath divine; 'tis forging Righteousness, and binds the Doer to do all, or die. Gal. v. 3. The Sum of all we have to say, in this Case, is *turn or burn*. Let Jesus Christ, as ruling King, attoning Priest, and teaching Prophet to the worst of Men, be always sounding in their Ears. 'Tis no more absurd than Bible, than Truth, than the Mind of God himself is. The Lord himself said to the Sick of the Palsy, *I say to thee arise*. Mark ii. 11. And to Lazarus, stone dead, *come forth*. John xi. 43. Peter also said to a natural Cripple, *in the Name of Jesus Christ—rise up and walk*. Acts iii. 6. The Words of God only we have to preach, and to expect Success only by his Energy.

4. Then we see what the moral Change must be. 'Tis to be as truly born of God, as we have been born of natural Parents. John iii. 3—5, 6. 'Tis to be raised from spiritual Death to a heavenly Life, as Jesus Christ was from bodily Death. Eph. ii. 4, 5, 6. 'Tis to be created a-new in Christ Jesus, unto holy living. Eph. ii. 10. 'Tis to have the Light of christian Knowledge, in our own selves, caused as Nature's Light was in the Beginning, and by the same Power. 2 Cor. iv. 6. 'Tis to be made

made like God, in the leading Biass of the Mind; to bear the Image of the heavenly, as we have born that of the earthly. 'Tis to be made to love what God loves, and to hate what he hates; because the Love of God is shed abroad in our Hearts. 'Tis to have the Truth abiding in us, which never abode there before. And to have the Spirit of that Truth dwelling in us thereby, which the World never receives. John xiv. 17. 'Tis to be obedient Children unto God, and zealous of good Works. In short, he who is so changed, of earthly is made heavenly; of carnal, is made spiritual; of dead in Sin, is alive unto God. Of Self-righteous is a divine Dependant; of a cordial Lover of the Creature only, now loves God above all. And of a hater of divine Sovereignty, because against his own, can now delight in it cordially, at the utter Expence of his own. And so he can have Pleasure in those Badges of it, which never yet pleased an unhumbed Soul. viz. "My Purpose shall stand; I will do all my Pleasure; and will have Mercy, on whom I will have Mercy."

5. Then we see how this Change must display and shew itself. Not by saying, *Lord, Lord*, without doing the very Things which he saith; but by walking in *all his Commandments and Ordinances* blamelessly. Not nourishing any depraved Taste, and making Provision for the Flesh, but crucifying the Flesh, with it's Affections and Lusts. Not practising on the Principle of Disaffection to divine Objects; but shewing Delight in the Law of the Lord. Not yielding in Matters of Faith, and christian Obedience, to the Masterhood of Custom, or any human Authority; but holding one Master, even him who is in Heaven. Not resting in Profession about the Gospel; but reducing Principles to visible Practice. Not shewing the Spirit of the World; but the Spirit of the Truth, as it is in Jesus. Not being ashamed of the Cross of Christ, but shewing that there is no practical Christianity, but in taking it up daily. Luke ix. 23. Not walking in Craftiness, or handling the Word of God deceitfully; but laying

laying aside, like a Garment quite worn out, and never to be put on again; all Malice, all Guile, and Hypocrisies, Envy and Evil-speaking; and as new-born Babes, desiring the sincere Milk of the Word, that ye may grow therein. 1 Pet. ii. 12. Not loving in Word, nor in Tongue, but in *Deed* and in *Truth*. 1 John iii. 18. Which 'tis impossible to do, while such Church-State, as the Bible describes, is despised, by being wholly neglected, or postponed to any other. 'Tis not shewing that the Disaffection is removed, and that fervent Love has taken the Lead of the Heart, to substitute and walk in any other Way, than what the heavenly Lover, has plainly marked out for his Subjects. If their Desire is not, "thy Will be done," doubtless they are not changed; if it is, doubtless the Fruit will appear in the same Things, about which that Will is plainly revealed. And then Peter's Confession, as the Rock on which the Lord builds his Church, in Opposition to all others, will be adopted. His own Headship alone avowed; and the spiritual Nourishment of his Body, held to be, as it's actual Union and Connection, by Joints and Bands, with that only Headship is. Col. ii. 19. And all Schemes for incorporating dead and disaffected Members, will be avoided, as counter to the Master's Will; and quite incompatible with the Nature, Design, and Cement of such a Corporation. The scriptural Notion of the Lord's Body, as consisting of live Members, united to the Head, by understanding or believing, what the Bible saith about him; and to one another by delightful Love; will again be revived. So also will the old Notion of Discipline, as totally comprized, in the mutual Practice of that Love. And so the ancient Badge of an Apostolic Church may be seen again, *in all being subject one to another*. 1 Pet. v. 5. And so far the Outcry of absurd! foolish! or impossible! often made by the disguised Enemies of the Gospel, against such Practices of Love and Duty, as the Lord requires of his Children, will be seen and known, to be nothing

nothing less than the native Symptoms of the old Disaffection, still remaining. 1 John ii. 20—29.

As the Bible teacheth, that the Holy Supper was instituted for Disciples; and that such continued in the Use of it, as steadfastly, as in the Apostle's Doctrine; Acts ii. 42. In so much that the first Day of the Week, was soon distinguished, by the Day, in which the Disciples break Bread. Acts xx. 7. And as Believers and their Seed, were always incorporate together, in the outward Administrations of the gracious Covenant. Gen. xvii. 9, 10. Gal. iii. 14. So Christ's Sheep hear his Voice in all these Things, and follow it. For he that saith, *I know him, and keepeth not his Commandments, is a Liar, and the Truth is not in him. But whoso keepeth his Word, in him verily, is the Love of God perfected. Hereby know we that we are in him. He that saith, he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.* 1 John ii. 4—6.

6. Then we see that the Scheme of the Bible, is a sure and most natural Way, to subdue the Pride, cure the Ignorance, and regulate the moral Disorders which abound among Men; by bringing just as many as receive it, to know clearly again, the two leading Characters which compose it; viz. that of God, and of human Nature. The proper Knowledge of both which was lost, when the Image of God was lost. For 'tis only in his Light that we can see Light. Just so certain it is, that all Men previous to the moral Change, are *equally* fallen from the Knowledge and Love of both these Characters. In Place of which Knowledge, ariseth Ignorance of both. And in Place of that Love, ariseth Enmity towards God, and the Things of God; and Envy toward one another. James iv. 4, 5. Tit. iii. 3. This last is as evident in Facts as the former; for though an Object of Misery may excite natural Compassion, yet no one, previous to the moral Change, has Complacence centring in any but himself. No Love, further than private Advantage riseth to View. Jude 16. So both the real Knowledge, and the genuine Love

of both these Characters, is received again, only by receiving Jesus Christ, who sustained them both. So there can be no more of christian Humanity, than there is of christian Divinity, in any Man living. So the Reverse of both abounds among Men. But every Soul which is made free through the Truth, does therein receive him, who acted out both Characters to the last Point. 'Tis no more evident of the Redeemer, that he honoured the divine Character in every Period of his Incarnation; than that in every one of those Periods, he was expending himself for Men; while he knew they were all his Haters. And finally, he acted out the last Point of Humanity; for while they were Sinners, and Enemies, he died for them. Rom. v. 8—10. The Gospel of Christ therefore, is the only christian School-Book, both for Divinity and for Humanity. Nor is either learned there, without the other, nor any further. Which shews the Importance of receiving, and of being conformed to the Bible. And if this cannot take Place, but in the Channel of the foregoing Argument, then it sufficiently establisheth the Importance of it's Design.

7. And lastly. Then we see the only Way, in which all the Words, and all the Works of God, may be seen harmonious. That they all centre in one only Point of Design, even the Honour of their Original, is as evident, as that there is no higher Good. That they every one, do in their Place, shew him forth, is just as evident, as that there is no higher Agency; and that he has all others in his Controul. That therefore they do harmonize, is as plain, as that they all have one great Author, Design, and End. That there is divine Delight in the View of this Harmony, is as evident, as that God is pleased with all his Words, and all his Works. But then that Sort of Delight must be peculiar to that Occasion. Then we can have none of that Delight, but in the same Sort of View of the same Objects. But no such View can be had by us, but by knowing, and cordially adopting the scriptural Plan of them. Then no one, who
has

has not received the Gospel, but is at Enmity with it's most divine Materials, can have any of this Sort of Happiness. Then all must be changed, or be miserable. Then the Hinge on which the real Welfare of Men turns, is that Knowledge of God, which is begun in the Soul, at the Time of the moral Change; and is evidential of it, by producing such Love, and such Conformity to the divine Nature and Dominion, as is the peculiar Production of that Knowledge. And which will endear his Name, and Words, and Works, as Monuments of Mercy by Jesus Christ, the only Hope of Transgressors, for ever and ever.

POSTSCRIPT.

BRITISH
5. OC76
MUSEUM



NOT RECORDED

the
Ex
tai
po
OF
lic
the
the
Au

P O S T C R I P T.

A WELL-KNOWN Dialogue, fell into the Author's Hand, a Year or two ago, on which he wrote some Remarks. But hearing soon that it was refuted by other Hands, he suppressed his Remarks. But he has seen this Year, a printed Letter, by the same Hand, in Vindication of the Dialogue, which in it's 15th Page urgeth, that because Regeneration is allowed to be a moral Change, it must therefore be wrought by moral Power; doubtless it means, as such. The Absurdity of which Conclusion was so striking, that he was desirous to communicate a few Sentiments on that Head. But being inclined, as much as may be, to avoid the surly Appearance of public Controversy; and yet to practice Duty to most venerable Truth; he has chosen to address himself, as in the Title-Page. Partly, because he can communicate his Views of the Points in Question, that Way, as well as any, to the Test of sober Judgments. And partly, because in that Way he has the more inviting Hope of an impartial Perusal.

Whether he is mistaken or not, in the foregoing Points, or in the Evidence by which they are supported; the Strength of Expression, which on a Review, he finds sometimes used, is certainly the Effect of his View of the Contents; and not of a Disposition to dictate to, or impose Sentiments on the respectable Objects of this Address. When any Sentiments are made publick, they become the Property of every Man; though not therefore to be abused by any. Those which are exhibited in the foregoing Argument, must run their own Risque. The Author is bound to honour all Men; and he holds in Esteem all
 O such

such as are couched in the Address of the foregoing Argument, and for the Reason therein assigned. Because it may be considered as Evidence of disinterested Views, and of divine Light, in a Point of Importance.

Nor has he chosen the criptic Stile of a By-stander, in Confidence of Secrecy; but for the same Reason which inclined him to suspend the above Hint of the Reason for publishing the foregoing Argument, to the last Page. And now, relying on divine Favour, as the only Hope of Man; and allowing the Need and Importance of his Reader's Candour, he desires always to wait the further Instructions of that Wisdom, which is from above; which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of Mercy, and good Fruits, without Wrangling, and without Hypocrisy.

Nov. 5, 1771.

